UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/590,264	06/09/2000	Yuji Imai	1341.1049/JDH	3754

21171 7590 11/25/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
CANGIALOSI, SALVATORE A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2661	3

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/590,264	IMAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Salvatore Cangialosi	2661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 June 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1. . The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
>
> Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cidon et al(433) in view of Lee et al.

Regarding claim 1 Cidon et al(See Figs. 5-7, Col. 7) disclose a packet having a header with two portions, one a single destination and a second portion simultaneously forwarding the packet to a plurality of destinations substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is use a specific list of destination addresses and an undistributed bitmap. Note that in Cidon et al the use of elements 60-62 a plurality of source based routing labels which represent destinations are believed the functional equivalent of a list of destination addresses. While element 64

of Cidon et al(Col. 9, lines 5-20) disclose a tree address which maps multicast distribution, Lee et al(Fig. 4, element 26b) shows a header in a multicast system employing a bitmap. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cidon et al because the tree address is in fact a map of distribution which can be replaced by a bitmap. It is noted that the routers in source based routing of Cidon et al are performed ny a plurality of nodes which relay packets among each other. Regarding inspection limitations of claim 2 Cidon et al, the ANR label is inspected and stripped which is substantially equivalent to what is claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is use a specific list of destination addresses and an undistributed bitmap. Note that in Cidon et al the use of elements 60-62 a plurality of source based routing labels which represent destinations are believed the functional equivalent of a list of destination addresses. While element 64 of Cidon et al(Col. 9, lines 5-20) disclose a tree address which maps multicast distribution, Lee et al(Fig. 4, element 26b) shows a header in a multicast system employing a bitmap. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cidon et al because the tree address is in fact a map of distribution which can be replaced by a bitmap.. Regarding claim 3 , the claim additionally requires processing of

the branching regularity mark. Note that the tree address of Cidon et al perform the claimed functions. If multicasting is required branching (of the tree) is enabled, if not it is bypassed. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cidon et al because the tree address performs the branching function. Regarding change of address to meaningless value limitations of claim 4, Cidon et al(Col. 2, lines 50-65) disclose stripping away of address labels which is believed to be the functional equivalent of meaningless. Regarding claim 5 Cidon et al(See Figs. 5-7, Col. 7) disclose a packet having a header with two portions, one a single destination and a second portion simultaneously forwarding the packet to a plurality of destinations substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is use a specific list of destination addresses and an undistributed bitmap. Note that in Cidon et al the use of elements 60-62 a plurality of source based routing labels which represent destinations are believed the functional equivalent of a list of destination addresses. While element 64 of Cidon et al(Col. 9, lines 5-20) disclose a tree address which maps multicast distribution, Lee et al(Fig. 4, element 26b) shows a header in a multicast system employing a bitmap. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cidon et

al because the tree address is in fact a map of distribution which can be replaced by a bitmap. Regarding claim 6 Cidon et al(See Figs. 5-7, Col. 7) disclose a packet having a header with two portions, one a single destination and a second portion simultaneously forwarding the packet to a plurality of destinations substantially as claimed. The differences between the above and the claimed invention is use a specific list of destination addresses and an undistributed bitmap and requires processing of the branching regularity mark. Note that in Cidon et al the use of elements 60-62 a plurality of source based routing labels which represent destinations are believed the functional equivalent of a list of destination addresses. Note that the tree address of Cidon et al perform the claimed functions. If multicasting is required branching (of the tree) is enabled, if not it is bypassed. While element 64 of Cidon et al(Col. 9, lines 5-20) disclose a tree address which maps multicast distribution, Lee et al(Fig. 4, element 26b) shows a header in a multicast system employing a bitmap. It would have been obvious to the person having ordinary skill in this art to provide a similar arrangement for Cidon et al because the tree address is in fact a map of distribution which can be replaced by a bitmap and because the tree address performs the branching function.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Salvatore Cangialosi at telephone number (703) 305-1837. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas Olms, can be reached at (703) 305-4703.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to (703)872-9306

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia, Sixth Floor(Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

S. Cangialosi

SALVATORE CANGIALOSI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222